

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated March 21, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 23, 2008. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24, and 25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24, and 25 remain pending following entry of this response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiesehuegel et al.* (U.S. Publication 2002/0128949, hereinafter, "*Wiesehuegel*") as applied to claims 1 and 11, and further in view of *Keating* (U.S. Publication 2002/0052895, hereinafter, "*Keating*") and *Hogan* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0187093, hereinafter, "*Hogan*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner asserts that paragraph [0067] of *Wiesehuegel* teaches Applicants' elements of "parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements" and "produc[ing] a re-configured web page." Applicants disagree.

Paragraph [0067] states:

"For example, in the preferred embodiment, a web page including a place bid button or icon is sent to the bidder including the information about the products to which he is entitled to bid normally (77). If the bidder decides to place a bid, he may click on the bid button, which will provide him with a bid form to complete with bid price and quantity. However, for items which a bidder is only allowed to read as a guest, the bid button is either disabled ('grayed out') and provided with an informational message such as 'Sorry, you are not allowed to bid on this item at this time,' or the bid button is removed from the web page (79) entirely."

As evidenced from the above recited portion and the *Wiesehuegel* disclosure as a whole, the *Wiesehuegel* arrangement relies on the generally known server side processing technology of generating web pages based on state information. For example, *Wiesehuegel* discloses Java servlets, Java Server Pages, and/or Microsoft's Active Server Pages as implementing technologies. Each of these technologies is a server side technology. One skilled in the art would recognize that to display or disable buttons or provide an informational message on a web page, as described in the above recited portion of *Wiesehuegel*, *Wiesehuegel* puts corresponding HTML attributes into web pages generated based off of state information within the server application. The created web pages are provided to clients (brokers) and displayed. However, this arrangement does not include producing a re-configured web-page. A web-page is simply created on the server side, provided to the client side, and displayed to the client.

In contrast, according to Applicants' claim 1, a web page is requested, provided, parsed, and re-configured, and only then is the re-configured web page displayed. The provided web-page serves as a template that is modified at the client side. More specifically, the web page is parsed to identify the user-selectable elements, such as buttons, and then re-configured according to an XSL transform definition. This is entirely different from the server side technology disclosed by *Wiesehuegel*.

Furthermore, *Wiesehuegel* does not even mention "parsing." Because *Wiesehuegel* discloses the server side technology of generating web pages, "parsing" is not inherent from *Wiesehuegel* any more than from any other general purpose web based application, where parsing is performed for rendering a web page. The latter is not the same as "parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements," as recited in independent claim 1.

Moreover, one of the goals of the *Wiesehuegel* arrangement is to provide a web page to a broker (client) that does not contain any sensitive information. Thus, application servers of the client side are provided with communications capability to an

authenticating server of the server side, where the sensitive information is stored on the server side. *Wiesehuegel*'s "preferred embodiment ... insure[s] that product offerings are made available only to entitled brokers" (see *Wiesehuegel*, paragraph [0061]). Therefore, even assuming that *Wiesehuegel* suggests parsing to identify the user-selectable elements, to prevent sensitive information from being inadvertently disclosed, such parsing must be performed at the server side, before the web page is provided to the client. In contrast, in Applicants' claimed arrangement the web page is parsed after such web page has been provided to the client side. Accordingly, *Wiesehuegel* fails to disclose at least "parsing the web-page to identify the user-selectable elements," "produc[ing] a re-configured web page," and "returning the re-configured web page for display," as recited in independent claim 1.

In making the §103 rejection based on combined teaching of *Wiesehuegel*, *Keating*, and *Hogan* the Examiner relies on the simple substitution rationale. However, notwithstanding whether such rationale is applicable in combining *Wiesehuegel*, *Keating*, and *Hogan*, Applicants' elements of "parsing the web-page to identify the user-selectable elements," "produc[ing] a re-configured web page," and "returning the re-configured web page for display" are absent in all of the references, alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants believe claim 1 is allowable and request allowance of the same.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are allowable at least for the reasons given above. With respect to claims 11, 24, 25, and the claims that depend therefrom, the claims contain subject matter similar to claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is also believed to be overcome for at least the reasons provided above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants